REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are currently pending in the application. Claims 8-11 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-4 are hereby cancelled. New claims 12-14 are presented for consideration.

Claims 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0130139, to Shiraishi et al. (Shiraishi), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,373,967, to Grooms et al. (Grooms). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Shiraishi in view of Grooms, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,020,978 (Szczepanski).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 5-7 and favorable consideration of new claims 12-14 are requested.

In paragraph 3 of the Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings as not showing the lateral width and thickness recited in claim 5. These dimensions are described in the first full paragraph on page 14 of the application. For clarity, each of the subject thickness and width has been identified with a letter designation, which has also been added to the drawings in Fig. 6.

In paragraph 4 of the Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings because of the use of the reference numeral 16 to designate both the outer shell and inner bag. Apparently, the Examiner is referred to the use of the reference numeral 16 and lead line on the left-hand side of Fig. 1. This reference numeral and lead line have been eliminated in the proposed amended drawings.

In light of the amendments made herein, withdrawal of the drawing objection is requested.

Claim 5 has been amended to characterize the front and rear wall portions and left and right wall portions as each having a thickness. The thicknesses of the front and rear wall portions and left and right wall portions are characterized as being selected so that: a) the front and rear wall portions can be pressed towards each other by squeezing forces applied by fingers of the user without being significantly warped; and b) the left and right wall portions are elastically deformable by the squeezing forces applied by the user's finger to the front and rear walls to allow the front and rear walls to be moved towards each other.

This structure is clearly described, for example, beginning at the bottom of page 4 through the conclusion of the paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7. For clarity, this language has been repeated by addition of the same to the Detailed Description at page 15.

As noted in applicant's original disclosure, this structure facilitates movement of the front and rear wall portions towards each other without significant deformation so that the inside volume of the bottle is potentially reduced more significantly and consistently than if the front and rear wall portions were deformed locally and irregularly under squeezing forces applied by a user's fingers. This construction is particularly useful for smaller bottles. Additionally, by making the left and right wall portions elastically deformable, there is less of a tendency of the bottle to fail under squeezing forces applied through a user's fingers.

Neither Shiraishi nor Grooms teaches or makes obvious the now claimed construction for the front and rear and left and right wall portions that facilitates bottle collapse as set forth in amended claim 1. One skilled in the art, looking at Shiraishi and

Grooms, would not appreciate the significance of the claimed structure in the absence of applicant's own teachings.

Accordingly, claim 5 is believed allowable.

Claims 6 and 7 and new claims 12-14 depend cognately from claim 5 and recite further significant limitations to further distinguish over the applied art.

Szczepanski does not, alone or in conjunction with any of the other cited art, teach or make obvious the subject matter of independent claim 5.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 5-7 and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER

By _____
John S. Mortimer
Reg. No. 30,407

October 12, 2009

500 West Madison Street
Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661-2562
(312) 876-2113